

ensure that public safety no longer receive interference, and that all of their relocation costs are covered in full with no possibility for a funding shortfall.

The second trap that I previously spoke of involves public safety's need for additional spectrum. While Congress and the FCC could spend their time finding and allocating public safety new spectrum, I believe it would be more prudent to eliminate the digital divide and give public safety the 24 MHz of spectrum they've been allocated in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. The Balanced Budget Act allocates an additional 24MHz of spectrum to public safety when broadcasters operating on their current analog spectrum transition to digital spectrum.

While many broadcasters have prepared for the transition, others have chosen to bet against congressional action and become spectrum squatters, holding hostage the very spectrum that public safety needs to protect this country. It is time for the broadcasters to vacate their analog spectrum, and I believe that under the leadership of Chairman BARTON and my colleagues at the Energy and Commerce Committee, we will be able to offer members the opportunity to vote on legislation that will eliminate the digital divide and get public safety the spectrum that they need to make our communities a safer place to live.

In closing I would like to recognize the public safety officials in our country for that work tirelessly to ensure that our families are safe and able to enjoy the freedoms that this country provides. While our troops abroad are working to ensure we don't see terrorism and war in our streets, it's our public safety officers that prevent and respond to events at home.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) is recognized until midnight.

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Speaker, I would like today to give not a novel, certainly not a unique overview of what I think some of the things we need to do to help win the battle of Iraq constitute. Again many of these things are being done, but I just want to try to put it forward as a comprehensive exposition of what we need to do to win. I think that there are three key areas involved in this struggle along all fronts upon which we have to continue to press: democracy, the economy and, of course, the military.

In terms of diplomacy, I believe everyone understands that the key now is

the holding of free elections on time in Iraq. The U.N. has agreed with this, and while their support is welcome, it remains tenuous. We should encourage all member states of the U.N. to rise to the challenge of democracy in Iraq and provide the necessary personnel to defend the monitors and help these elections go forward. For as we know, what is going to happen is that the terrorist counterattack on democracy in Iraq will escalate. They will do everything they can to derail these elections. Yet that violence and terror in and of itself should not be enough to deter us and certainly should not deter the Iraqi people.

And as for the naysayers who claim that absent a perfect election in Iraq, it cannot be deemed a representative success, I would just like to ask those detractors to ask themselves why we demand more from the Iraqi people in a civil war than we demanded from ourselves in our own American civil war; because all one needs to do is to look at the map of 1864 to see that the States in rebellion did not participate in Abraham Lincoln's reelection. Yet I highly doubt that anyone today can say that it was not a representative election nor an election that was worthy of the American people.

In terms of the economy, one of the things that we face in Iraq clearly is the passive-aggressive resistance of the Iraqi people. After years of oppression, after years of being terrorized and after seeing so many international promises fall away, it is very difficult for them to stand up and fight on their own without the assurance that the United States and our coalition partners will be behind them. But it is also important to remember that while we provide them the possibility of a transformational change from tyranny to democracy, we must always remember that in any representative political system there is also a transactional element; for it is one thing to profess ideals to an oppressed people who have been newly liberated, it is another thing to provide concrete, tangible benefits to the populace to show them the investment in their future.

I think that one of the things that we have to do in Iraq is build on the town council model. We have to take a bottom-up approach, a grassroots approach to reconstruction in Iraq. We have to have and invest full decision-making authority into town councils, tribal leaders, religious leaders, and other community organizations that have been set up, let them determine what infrastructure projects in their area must be worked upon, let them figure out the processes by which they will come to these determinations and let them have control of the money to implement these decisions. These are very formative, basic steps along the road to a transition to democracy and to building lasting institutions upon which the Iraqi people can build.

I also think that in conjunction with the grassroots approach to the local

control of the decision-making and the implementation of those decisions is that we should adopt an Iraqi oil fund similar to the one that we have in the State of Alaska. The Iraqi oil fund would take portions of the proceeds from the sale of Iraq's oil, place it in a fund and distribute it per capita to the people of Iraq.

The benefits of such a model, which we have seen in Alaska, will be also readily apparent in Iraq. It will provide a direct economic benefit to the people of Iraq, showing them the stake in their future. It will provide an immediate jump-start to the Iraqi economy and get them up to the average per capita spending that is expected to start any semblance of a stable economy. I think we should also use it as spur to register adults to vote in the upcoming elections, for if one is not a registered voter, one cannot receive the benefits of the Iraqi oil fund.

I think that this will also prove to help uproot terrorists because no terrorist will be eligible to receive the per capita annual appropriation from the Iraqi oil fund. This will also, in turn, I believe help the Iraqi people further their efforts to defend their oil infrastructure and further their efforts to uproot the terrorists who would disturb it because the money would be being taken out of their mouths. It would be taken out of their children's mouths. In short, it would be an intolerable situation for them to allow to continue.

□ 2310

I think that we would also see a quelling of some of the sectionalism. I think we would begin to see that oil, rather than a divisive force amongst the regions of Iraq, could then be used as a means of unifying them and perhaps give them a greater semblance of an Iraqi national identity.

As we have seen throughout the history of Iraq, oil has often been used as the dictator's tool for fueling his oppression of his people. If this oil fund is written into the Iraqi constitution, not only will it hasten the adoption of an Iraqi constitution, it will safeguard against one individual being able to rise up and usurp control of the oil funds because truly the oil will belong to the people, and I believe the people will jealously guard this right under their new constitution.

I think it will also do one other thing: It will make the people less susceptible to any attempts by the terrorists or any future dictator to prey upon their impoverishment by offering them blandishments or other remunerative items in return for their loyalty to a new regime or to a new movement.

I think from the United States' point of view it will do something very important: It will belie the perception amongst much of the Middle Eastern population and amongst some of Western Europe and amongst some of our own population that the United States is there to take the oil, for we are not. The oil belongs to the Iraqi people.